

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 4, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-9 are now in the application. Claim 9 has been added. Support for claim 9 can be found in claim 1 and page 10, lines 23-26 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-3, 5, and 7 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Eitel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,133,543) (hereinafter "Eitel") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 4, 2006

the suction openings and the ventilation openings in the feed table corresponding with the through openings in the suction belt.

The Eitel reference discloses a sheet conveying table (1) with a pair of essentially parallel conveyor belts (4). The conveyor belts (4) have a plurality of belt perforations (7) that are arranged on the belts (4) to overlie suction bore holes (2) formed in the surface of the conveyor table (1). Eitel discloses compensation bore holes (61 and 62) disposed between the belts (4). The compensation bore holes (61 and 62) are in contact with atmospheric pressure on the underside of the table and prevent the build-up of any negative pressure between the belts (4).

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation on page 2 of the Office action that Eitel discloses that "ventilations opening correspond with the through openings in the belt", are not accurate. More specifically, Eitel discloses that the compensation bore holes (61 and 62) are disposed between the belts (4). Accordingly, the compensation bore holes do not correspond with the through holes (7) of the belt (4). Moreover, Eitel does not in any way disclose that the ventilation openings correspond to the through openings in the belt. To the contrary, Figs. 2 and 3 of Eitel show that

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 4, 2006

the compensations bore holes (61 and 62) are disposed next to the belt (4) only are only in an effective communication with a transported sheet.

The reference does not show the suction openings and the ventilation openings in the feed table corresponding with the through openings in the suction belt, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Eitel discloses that the belt has through holes which correspond to suction bore holes. Eitel does not disclose ventilation holes that correspond to the through holes in the belt. This is contrary to the present invention as claimed, in which the suction openings and the ventilation openings in the feed table correspond with the through openings in the suction belt.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Eitel, dependent claims 3, 5, and 7 are believed to be allowable as well.

The following further remarks pertain to new claim 9.

Claim 9 calls for *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 4, 2006

the suction openings corresponding with the through openings and being disposed in a V-shape for acting with vacuum upon the through openings.

The Eitel reference discloses that the two rows of suction bore holes (2) are generally parallel each other and extend along an upper surface (6) of conveyor table (1) in two spaced rows (column 4, lines 41-44).

The reference does not show the suction openings corresponding with the through openings and being disposed in a V-shape for acting with vacuum upon the through openings, as recited in claim 9 of the instant application. Eitel discloses that the suction bore holes are disposed in two parallel rows. Eitel does not disclose that the suction bore holes are disposed in a V-shape. This is contrary to the present invention as claimed, in which the suction openings correspond with the through openings and are disposed in a V-shape for acting with vacuum upon the through openings.

It is appreciatively noted from page 3 of the Office action that claims 4, 6, and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claims have not been

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 4, 2006

amended as indicated by the Examiner, as the claims are
believed to be patentable in their existing form.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the
references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either
show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 9. Claims 1 and 9
are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and
since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on
claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of
claims 1-9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims
to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone
call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked
out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 4, 2006

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

August 3, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101